DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 198 CG 012 944

TITLE	The Psychological Effects of Mobile Home Living Upon a Selected Group of Wheelchair College Students.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[76]
GRANT	H-2110R
NOTE	25p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Students; *Daily Living Skills; *Handicapped Students; Higher Education; *Mental Health; *Physically Handicapped; Psychological Studies; Research Projects; *Self Concept

ABSTRACT

The physical barriers in mobile homes were removed, and modifications made, to accommodate wheelchair students. These selected students were tested to determine psychological factors which might be important in mobile home living. The results of personal interviews, psychological tests and personal observation indicated that the physical surroundings and physical adjustment go hand in hand with psychological adjustment. The nature and range of personal problems decreased as a result of mobile home living for the students (N=10) in the study. The direction of the study was such that all students felt very strongly that they profited from the experience in independent living. There were more people visiting them in the mobile home than in the dormitory, while the effect on grades was mixed. Overall, the participants rated the experiment a success. (Author/BN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED162198

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF MOBILE HOME LIVING UPON A SELECTED GROUP OF WHEELCHAIR COLLEGE STUDENTS*

Purpose:

The purpose of this study was to investigate the psychological factors considered important to orthopedically handicapped students, restricted to wheelchairs, living in mobile homes on the St. Andrews Presbyterian College campus. Understandably, these psychological factors would be complex in nature and therefore many approaches were used. These approaches include the following: personal interviews at intervals of three to four months, psychological tests which might have an importance in determining the nature of the adjustment to mobile home living, and factors such as change in self-concept and self-confidence. Also, observation was sytematically done to determine the effects of mobile home living on handicapped students. This study applies only to college students due to the selected population which was studied.

Plan of the Study:

The plan of the study was to compare the disabled students, restricted to wheelchairs who were living in mobile homes with a control group living in the dormitories at St. Andrews Presbyterian College. This direct approach proved to be impossible, as finding students to form a matched pair in a very small pop-

*This study was supported by the Office of Housing & Urban Development Contract Grant No. H-2110R

CG012944

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ulation presented severe problems. Among the more difficult problems were matching as to the important variables, including sex, time of injury or birth defect, the amount of handicap and psychological adjustment as measured by representative psychological instruments. In order to secure a control group the data from a study which was completed in 1971, Urie, Student Aides for Handicapped College Students was used. Also included were a few additional students who attended St. Andrews Presbyterian College after the study was completed. They were included because they represented complete data, and had similar handicapping conditions to the persons in the mobile home study. Another group of students was selected from this St. Andrews Presbyterian College study group, because the psychological and physical factors were so very close to the ten students who comprised the mobile home study group. The project students lived in mobile home units on the St. Andrews Presbyterian College campus for varying lengths of time, and therefore in order to obtain a sample size that was not too small they were considered as one group; that is, if any effects were to be demonstrated, they should be demonstrated regardless of length of time spent in the mobile homes. The students in the mobile home study occupied the mobile homes from four months to a complete school year. Had the time of stay been longer than this, two years or more, it is possible that different areas would have appeared in their psychological adjustment. In order to control for the effects of St. Andrews Presbyterian College environment, the control groups were compared with the mobile home residents, and the mobile

home residents also became their own control group. The interviews proved to be one of the most valuable features of the entire psychological study, because many of the changes that were noted in the psychological instruments, were verified in the interviews. (See Appendix A) The mobile home group, and the handicapped population of St. Andrews Presbyterian College students were compared on psychological tests as to changes over a period of time for both groups, and accordingly pre-and-post-test measures were used in both cases.

In preparation for the study, the following action was taken: (1) A questionnaire was prepared and mailed to eight individuals who were both physically handicapped and restricted to wheelchairs, and who resided in mobile homes. Of this group, six returned the questionnaire with complete answers. (2) A literature search was conducted by mailing to the American Psychological Association a form requesting all research related to the psychological effects of living in a mobile home for the handicapped. This is a search of Psychological Abstracts from 1967 to the present. This search yielded no references.

There are some studies which, although not directly related to mobile home living, do have important implications in this study. One such study is the Highland Heights Experiment which used essentially a Health and Social model in its approach and in many ways cannot be applied to the present study. However, there are some important findings in that study which do have direct bearing on the present study. Conclusion"C" on page 67 of the Highland Heights Experiment Report, "The present short

term impact study has also left unanswered important questions of how persons with different types of functional disabilities respond to residency in Highland Heights. Nor have the differential effects of a variety of types of conventional housing of persons with different types of functional disabilities been investigated". This is important for our present study because mobile homes present one approach to the problem of modifying housing and its effects for a range of functional disabilities. The question of conclusion "D" on pages 68-69 cannot be satisfactorily answered by this study because of its small sample size. It is not known, at this time, whether or not all of our physically disabled students could profit from the mobile home experience, or if the ones who were selected actually were the ideal ones who could receive the maximum benefit from the experience. Conclusion "E" of the Highland Heights Experiment, page 69 states, "The short term study of Highland Heights has had a positive impact on the health and well-being of its residents". The present study has verified the conclusion stated above, although our population was younger than the Highland Heights population and was enrolled in college during the length of the study.

Dunn (1976) points to a very important consideration for this study. "Differences in the psychological adjustment between persons who have varying degrees of disability have been noted: it appears that those whose disabilities are less severe may experience greater psychological problems due to their more marginal position between the 'world of the physically normal majority' and the ' world of the physically dis-

abled minority'. But perhaps the finding of greatest import is that an individual's response to rehabilitative treatment is determined more by the attitudes they hold toward themselves, i. e., their self-concept, than by their degree of physical disability." The importance of this statement comes from an understanding that individuals who entered the mobile homes in this present project brought with them certain concepts about themselves and these self-concepts have an important bearing upon the impact that the mobile home experience had upon them.

Factors that were not investigated in this present study, but may have an important bearing in directions for future research are as follows: (1) Does the age at which the person is injured have any effect upon their adjustment to mobile home living: (In our very preliminary attempt to answer this question, the answer appears to be that it does have a very important impact upon personal adjustment.) (2) Would students who are severely disabled and in wheelchairs show as much or more improvement in their overall self-concept and independent living if they lived in modified apartments off campus? (This obviously would have been the ideal control group, but this simply could not be done, there are not enough apartments that have been architecturally modified to accommodate the number of students in this project.) (3) Would students have experienced more changes in self-concept and independence had they been permitted to stay a longer period of time in the mobile home?

Other studies have shown that the self-concept is an important consideration for the physically disabled such as

Breslin (1968), Dunn (1967), and Smits (1964). These studies and others have shown that the self-concept of the severely disabled student is different from the average student in college, and Urie (1971) also demonstrated this in the St. Andrews Presbyterian College Study. The conclusion is: studying any group of disabled population, the appropriate population for comparison is a similar group of handicapped students and therefore the published normative data for the psychological measuring instruments should not be used. Of the eight persons in wheelchairs living in mobile homes referred to earlier in this report, six returned the questionnaire with complete information. By far the most outstanding problem cited was the lack of physical modification in the mobile homes for these individuals. Other factors were the remoteness or nearness of neighbors, and the mobile home community itself.

The two groups of fifty persons represent somewhat different populations of St. Andrews Presbyterian College students for comparison with the mobile home study group. The St. Andrews Presbyterian College Mobile Home Study Group consisted of five males and five females with complete and usable data. All of the study data is related to St. Andrews Presbyterian College students for the samples of fifty students and the sample of ten students.

The following scales were administered to the St. Andrews Presbyterian College Mobile Home Study Group: (1) The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965): (2) The Adjective Checklist (Gough, 1965); (3) The Handicapped Problems Inventory

(Wright, 1960); and (4) The Activities of Daily Living (Katz, 1963). In addition, periodic interviews were conducted with the mobile home project individuals in order to obtain subjective reports of adjustment problems and progress.

Discussion:

Table I presents the results for the Handicapped Problems Inventory. The total score, although not significant statistically, decreased from 50.90 to 43.10. This is important in showing that while the individual lived in the mobile home, the number of problems checked decreases. This is some indication that the individual was becoming somewhat less sensitive to the handicap and not experiencing as many problems with it. (This is also confirmed by the interviews.) The vocational, family, and social areas remained essentially the same; the personal area showed decline of 4.3 points which, although not significant, indicates that mobile home living was having an effect on the person's perception of a wide variety of other factors and will be discussed in the interview section. In a comparison of the Tennessee Self-Concept of the original selected sample of handicapped as indicated in Table II, there is very little difference between our sample and the original group with the following exceptions: Family Self is lower for the mobile home group. This may be an indication that they felt themselves to be less adequate as family members than the original sample, although both means are well within the normal range of scores. Total variability is less for the mobile home sample, probably due to the fact that they were somewhat

more homogeneous than the original sample and generally were older than the original sample. Column Variability was also significantly different for the two groups, again reflecting more consistency in the mobile home sample. The use of four, two, and one (response categories) as opposed to five is indicative that the mobile home sample felt less sure of themselves and tended to describe themselves in more negative terms or responses. The mobile home group was somewhat better adjusted overall as indicated on the general Maladjustment Scale and the Personality Integration Scale. In general we had a group who were somewhat more negative about themselves as they entered the experiment, felt less positive about feing a family member, and generally were slightly better adjusted than the original sample. First, we compare "before and after" self-views of the students entering the mobile home project and leaving the mobile home project. This comparison is found in Table III. They show very little change, and although statistically not significant, there are a number of interesting results. For example, in the Total Positive Score, the mean increased from 333.39 to 338.89, which suggest that the group was feeling more positive about themselves after having been in the experiment than they did before. The Personal Self also shows a slight increase which was confirmed by the Handicapped Problems Inventory. Column Variability declines in a statistically significant way, which indicated a greater correspondence in self-perception of the individual selves than that which was indicated when they entered the project. Because of some additional date, added to the original sample, the next group

comparison is based upon fifty subjects rather than the original forty-one. The Pre-test group shows about the same differences on the Tennessee as the study preceding this one and the data are presented in Table IV. What is interesting about this is that although students were not selected for this mobile home project on the basis of their original psychological adjustment, the project group was slightly better adjusted than the control group of fifty subjects. Part of this may be due to the small sample size, or in part it may be due to the fact that mobile home participants are somewhat more adventurous than the average handicapped student at St. Andrews Presbyterian College.

The next step is to compare the post-test Tennessee Self-Concept for the sample of fifty with the mobile home group and this is what the post-testing represents. Here we see about the same difference indicating that the mobile home living experience did not change the overall handicapped post-group controls. The mobile home students remained better integrated than those who had spent four years living in a traditional St. Andrews Presbyterian College pattern. Table IV presents the data for the Pre-and-Post-Test Adjective Checklist for Mobile Home group. There are not statistically significant changes in the scores from the first testing period to the last. Some areas do show very slight gains from one testing to the next. Self-confidence remains approximately the same, and there is very slight change in the scores for self-control. The interviews were very interesting in that some things in the tests cited above were beginning to reflect, and under

longer conditions would probably reflect in a statistically significant way. There were differences in the two general groups that occupied the mobile homes. The first group knew each other quite well, and had already formed some bonds for establishing a social community in the location of the mobile homes. The second group did not have this common social experience of knowing each other and therefore had to depend more on the aide or persons coming to visit them than the first group. The first group had established friendships longer and as a result had far more visitors in their stay than the second group. Possibly some of this is due to the length of stay of the first group of students on the campus since nearly all of them were seniors. The interviews also reflect all of this. The second group felt more lonely and isolated and with less friendships and less opportunity to entertain than the first group. The first group generally looked forward to the experience of living in a mobile home; the second group did not look forward to the experience as much. In every case in the interviews, the individuals reported positive gains in their self-confidence and emphasized again and again how much independence they felt as a result of the experience. For example, "I found that I could do things that I never thought I could do, and I found out that I really can cook". This statement from a male who was expressing something that was common to the students, namely that they were exploring and trying new things that were not necessary in the dornitory or could be done by someone else. In many ways this experience was very new territory for all of them.

The number of hours spent in household chores varied from four hours per week to sexteen hours per week. The males spent far less time in meal preparation than the females and less time in housework. The mean for household chores was eight hours, for cooking the time ranged from four hours per week to a maximum of twenty with the mean being about fifteen hours. The more severely handicapped reported longer hours which could be expected.

Are grades affected by the time taken for other duties? The universal answer from all participants was thay were not. They would have spent time doing other things. Because of many variables such as the difficulty of courses, the number of courses, and the instructors, five students increased in grade point averages, three students decreased and two students remained about the same. Thus, living in mobile homes did not have a bearing upon the students' study habits. Those conclusions come from subjective interviews as well as the grade point data. What is important is that the organization of time which a student brings to the mobile home will be the same organization of time that is used in the dorm or elsewhere. Students generally took on more household chores such as sweeping, cooking, washing dishes, and other things. Most of them reported that they enjoyed doing things for themselves and felt confident that they could do them again, given the opportunity. None of the students felt that the mobile home experience was anything more than temporary, and would prefer to live on a long term basis either in a house or an apartment.

As far as safety was concerned, they felt safe in the mobile home, and felt protected as well as they could be. (There was actually very little reporting of fear of any kind other than the usual academic fears.) All of the group was very positive about the total experience and would do it again if the opportunity presented itself.

Conclusions:

Students generally felt that they profited very much from the experience. We had one married couple in the experiment, the husband is the handicapped and the wife able-bodied, and they reported that their experience was very worthwhile. The wife adjusted to the changing conditions very quickly and learned to do things more efficiently according to her own report.

The major feeling was one of independence for the persons in the project; a few had problems with self-discipline in getting everything done that needed to be done, but most of them adjusted to the experience very well and considered it very worthwhile. Some students entered the experiment with a degree of anticipation of a new experience, others felt that the change would be greater than they had anticipated and after a few days were well adjusted to their different existence. Some of them missed the social life of the dorm, but this was to a certain extent compensated for by frequent visits of friends. Although no formal study was made of the small community itself, most of the students reported that there was a great deal of compatibility between themselves and others in

the project. When there was a problem it usually was between the handicapped person and the aide living with them, and this problem was rare and usually settled quickly.

Generally, the subjective reports indicated that the project was worthwhile, and given an additional opportunity, the students would participate again.

Because some of the project students have not graduated from St. Andrews Presbyterian College, a follow-up will continue as to their living conditions and employment.

A final conclusion indicated by this study is that physical and psychological factors are closely related; if the physical barriers are removed, the psychological adjustment factors become much easier to deal with.

Bibliography

"Activities of Daily Living", St. Andrews Presbyterian College, Laurinburg, North Carolina, 1965.

Brown, Janet R. (Case Western Reserve U.) An exploratory study of change in self-concept. Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 28(10-A), 3990-3991.

Breslin, Hazel B. (Oregon State U.) The relationship between the physically handicapped child's self-concept and his peer reputation. Dissertation Abstracts, 1068, 29(4-B) 1943.

Dunn, Marilyn. "Satisfaction With Social Relationships of College Students Who Are Physically Disabled".Dissertation University Micro Films, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1967.

Fall River Housing Authority. Highland Heights Apartments, 36 Months Report of Progress. Fall River, Mass. Sept., 1973.

Fitts, William H. "Manual for the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale", Counseling Recordings and Tests. Nashville, Tennessee, 1965.

Fitts, William and Hamner, William T. "The Self-Concept and Delinquency". Nashville Mental Health Center. Monograph I, Nashville, Tennessee, 1969.

Fitts, William. "Inter Personal Competence: The Wheel Model", Studies on the self-concept and rehabilitation, DEDE Wallace Center, Monograph II. Nashville, Tennessee, 1970.

Fitts, William, et al. "The Self-Concept and Self-Actualizations". Studies on the self-concept and rehabilitation, DEDE Wallace Center, Monograph III. Nashville, Tennessee, 1971.

Fitts, William. "The Self-Concept and Psychopathology", Studies on the self-concept and rehabilitation, DEDE Wallace Center, Monograph IV. Nashville, Tennessee, 1972.

Fitts, William. "The Self-Concept and Performance", Studies on the self-concept and rehabilitation. DEDE Wallace Center, Monograph V. Nashville, Tennessee, 1972.

Fitts, William. "The Self-Concept and Behavior". Studies on the self-concept and rehabilitation, DEDE Wallace Center, Monograph VII. Nashville, Tennessee, 1972.

Gough, Harrison G., and Heilburn, Alfred B., Jr. "Manual for the Adjective Checklist", Consulting Psychologist Press, Palo Alto, California, 1965.

Lawton, Edith Burchwald. Activities of Daily Living for Physical Rehabilitation. New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.

Redmond, Frances H. (Kent State U.) Growth and Development of the Self-Concept. Dissertation Abstracts 1967, 28 (2-A), 506.

Rosen, Gerald M. and Ross, Alan O. (U. of Pittsburgh) Relationship of Body Image to Self-Concept. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32(1). 100.

Thompson, Warren, "Correlates of the Self-Concept", Studies on the Self-Concept and Rehabilitation, DEDE Wallace Center Monograph VI, Nashville, Tennessee, 1972.

Tucker, William V. Higher Education and Handicapped Students. (Research Report RD-812-P; Vocational Rehabilitation Administration) Emporia: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964.

Urie, Robert, et al, "Student Aides for Handicapped College Students", Final Report, Social and Rehabilitation Services, Project No. 12-P-55156--4-05(RD-2424-G), 1971.

Wright, G. N. and Remmers, H. H., "Manual for Handicapped Problems Inventory", Purdue Research Foundation, Lafayette, Ind., 1960.

Wright, George N. and Trotter, Ann. Rehabilitation Research. Madison: The University of Wisconsin, 1968.

Wylie, Ruth, "The Self-Concept", Vol. I, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1974.

TABLE I

TITLE: COMPARISION OF MOBILE HOME PROJECT PARTICIPANTS ON THE HANDICAPPED PROBLEMS INVENTORY:

PRE AND POST-TEST

	N=10 Pre-Test		N=10 Post-Test		
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	"t"
TOTAL	50.90	31.40	43.10	27.71	.59
VOCATIONAL	8.30	10.07	8.20	6.23	.03
FAMILY	12.00	9.20	9.70	7.42	.62
PERSONAL	18.90	10.50	14.60	11.33	.88
SOCIAL	11.70	9.12	10.70	7.80	.26

Comparison of Mobile Home Project Participants from Pre-testing to Post-Testing

A COMPARISON OF A SELECTED GROUP OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS AT ST. ANDREWS PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE WITH MOBILE HOME PARTICIPANTS ON THE TENNESSEE SELF-CONCEPT PRE-TESTING

TABLE II

	N=50 Pre		N=10 Pre		
	Means	S.D.'s	Means	S.D.'s	"t"
Self-Criticism	37.43	5.88	1.08	5.36	1.75
True/False	1.09	.23	1.08	.18	.06
Net Conflict	-0.63	11.34	0.10	9.15	-.19
Total Conflict	31.94	9.44	26.90	8.45	1.56
Total Positive	346.75	26.10	338.89	23.84	.88
Identity	127.33	8.66	121.60	8.37	1.92
Self-Satisfaction	106.84	13.18	107.70	11.19	-.19
Behavior	112.26	9.32	109.60	7.41	.85
Physical Self	65.65	6.21	67.30	6.16	-.76
Moral-Ethical Self	71.14	8.19	67.80	6.98	1.20
Personal Self	66.89	5.87	68.60	3.66	-.88
Family Self	72.65	7.33	67.20	8.37	2.09*
Social Self	70.95	6.92	68.00	6.75	1.24
Total Variability	47.04	12.11	36.60	10.13	2.55**
Column Variability	28.53	8.48	19.30	8.87	3.11**
Row Variability	18.71	5.70	15.40	4.38	1.73
Distribution	116.84	24.24	102.40	16.56	1.79
No. 5's	16.37	9.68	10.50	8.70	1.77
No. 4's	24.82	6.95	32.30	7.15	-3.09**
No. 3's	19.75	8.36	19.40	6.75	.13
No. 2's	16.99	7.14	26.50	6.00	-3.92**
No. 1's	19.26	8.59	11.30	4.94	2.82**
Defensive Positive	52.53	8.38	55.20	9.35	-.90
General Maladjustment	97.41	6.80	91.70	8.34	2.33**
Psychosis	47.43	7.04	49.80	4.66	-1.02
Personality Disorder	74.40	11.95	73.00	12.04	.34
Neurosis	83.24	7.95	84.70	9.13	-.51
Personality Integration	10.16	3.67	13.00	5.27	-2.05*
No. of Deviant Signs***					

*Sig. at .05 Level
**Sig. at .01 Level
***Not Scored on Selected Group

A COMPARISON OF THE MOBILE HOME PROJECT PARTICIPANTS
ON THE TENNESSEE SELF-CONCEPT SCALE
PRE AND POST TESTING

TABLE III

	N=10		N=10		
	Means	S.D.'s	Means	S.D.'s	"t"
Self-Criticism	35.80	7.17	33.90	5.36	.67
True/False	1.07	.24	1.09	.18	1.68
Net Conflict	-1.20	13.00	0.10	9.16	-.26
Total Conflict	30.80	9.92	26.90	8.45	.95
Total Positive	333.39	35.26	338.89	23.84	-.41
Identity	120.40	13.97	121.60	8.37	-.23
Self-Satisfaction	104.90	15.43	107.70	11.19	-.46
Behavior	108.10	12.13	109.60	7.41	-.33
Physical Self	64.40	7.34	67.30	6.16	-.96
Moral-Ethical Self	69.10	7.40	67.80	6.99	.40
Personal Self	65.90	8.81	68.60	3.65	.89
Family Self	66.70	11.53	67.20	8.37	-.11
Social Self	67.30	9.91	68.00	6.75	-.18
Total Variability	46.90	14.05	36.60	10.13	1.88
Column Variability	27.40	8.84	19.30	8.87	2.04*
Row Variability	19.50	6.29	15.40	4.37	1.69
Distribution	107.30	13.78	102.40	16.56	.72
No. 5's	15.00	7.91	10.50	8.70	1.21
No. 4's	26.80	6.05	32.30	7.16	-1.85
No. 3's	19.70	7.68	19.40	6.75	.09
No. 2's	24.90	7.52	26.50	6.00	-.53
No. 1's	13.70	6.64	11.30	4.94	1.01
Defensive Positive	50.90	10.92	55.20	9.35	-.95
General Maladjustment	89.70	11.20	91.70	8.34	-.45
Psychosis	51.70	7.45	49.80	4.66	.68
Personality Disorder	71.90	12.47	73.00	12.04	-.20
Neurosis	81.70	10.95	84.70	9.13	-.67
Personality Integration	12.30	4.37	13.00	5.27	-.32
No. of Deviant Signs	8.80	7.06	9.20	7.46	-.12

*Sig. at .05 Level
**Sig. at .01 Level

COMPARISON OF ST. ANDREWS PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE HANDICAPPED STUDENT SAMPLE WITH MOBILE HOME PROJECT PARTICIPANTS ON THE TENNESSE SELF-CONCEPT PRE-TEST

TABLE IV

	N=50		N=10		
	Means	S.D.'s	Means	S.D.'s	"t"
Self-Criticism	37.64	5.90	35.80	7.18	.87
True/False	1.05	.27	1.07	.24	-.20
Net Conflict	-1.46	12.52	-1.20	13.00	-.06
Total Conflict	31.06	7.72	30.80	9.92	-.09
Total Positive	339.14	30.57	333.39	35.26	53
Identity	123.78	10.92	120.40	13.98	.85
Self-Satisfaction	103.94	13.84	104.90	15.44	-.20
Behavior	111.14	10.23	108.10	12.13	.83
Physical Self	64.92	6.42	64.40	7.34	.23
Moral-Ethical Self	68.52	8.28	69.10	7.40	-.21
Personal Self	65.29	7.22	65.90	8.81	-.23
Family Self	71.09	8.84	66.70	11.52	1.36
Social Self	69.79	7.91	67.30	9.91	.87
Total Variability	46.08	11.33	46.90	14.05	-.20
Column Variability	27.66	8.31	27.40	8.85	.09
Row Variability	18.62	5.34	19.50	6.29	-.46
Distribution	112.32	25.65	107.30	13.78	.60
No. 5's	15.28	10.30	15.00	7.91	.08
No. 4's	23.64	6.65	26.80	6.05	-1.39
No. 3's	21.78	8.96	19.70	7.69	.68
No. 2's	17.92	7.24	24.90	7.52	-2.77**
No. 1's	17.78	8.58	13.70	6.64	1.44
Defensive Positive	51.14	10.68	50.90	10.92	.06
General Maladjustment	95.78	8.38	89.70	11.20	1.98*
Psychosis	47.32	6.47	51.70	7.45	-1.91
Personality Disorder	71.64	11.31	71.90	12.47	-.07
Neurosis	81.96	10.54	81.70	10.95	.07
Personality Integration	9.48	3.20	12.30	4.37	-2.39*
No. of Deviant Signs***					

*Sig. at .05 Level
**Sig. at .01 Level
***Not Scored for Original Sample

A COMPARISON OF ST. ANDREWS PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE HANDICAPPED STUDENT SAMPLE WITH MOBILE HOME PROJECT PARTICIPANTS ON THE TENNESSEE SELF-CONCEPT SCALE POST-TEST

TABLE V

	N=50		N=10		
	Means	S.D.'s	Means	S.D.'s	"t"
Self-Criticism	37.79	5.53	33.90	5.36	1.93
True/False	1.02	.19	1.09	.19	-.95
Net Conflict	-3.07	8.62	.10	9.15	-.99
Total Conflict	29.27	9.81	26.90	8.45	.68
Total Positive	341.55	32.05	338.89	23.84	.24
Identity	125.03	11.45	121.60	8.37	.87
Self-Satisfaction	106.55	12.58	107.70	11.19	-.26
Behavior	110.10	12.22	109.60	7.41	.12
Physical Self	66.79	7.23	67.30	6.16	-.20
Moral-Ethical Self	70.21	8.32	67.80	6.99	.82
Personal Self	65.38	7.83	68.60	3.65	-1.25
Family Self	70.69	8.76	67.20	8.38	1.10
Social Self	68.55	8.12	68.00	6.75	.19
Total Variability	45.83	11.60	36.60	10.13	2.23*
Column Variability	27.45	7.53	19.30	8.87	2.82**
Row Variability	18.38	6.34	15.40	4.38	1.37
Distribution	108.76	29.46	102.40	16.56	.64
No. 5's	14.79	10.64	10.50	8.70	1.15
No. 4's	25.31	8.28	32.30	7.16	-2.37*
No. 3's	22.34	11.84	19.40	6.75	.74
No. 2's	19.59	8.76	26.50	6.00	-2.30
No. 1's	16.34	10.31	11.30	4.94	1.48
Defensive Positive	50.82	9.39	55.20	9.35	-1.27
General Maladjustment	94.69	9.69	91.70	8.34	.87
Psychosis	47.65	7.40	49.80	4.66	-.86
Personality Disorder	73.96	9.99	73.00	12.04	.25
Neurosis	81.72	10.31	84.70	9.13	-.81
Personality Integration	10.31	-4.56	13.00	5.27	-1.55
No. of Deviant Signs***					

*.05 Level of Sig.
**.01 Level of Sig.
***Not Scored for or original Sample

A COMPARISON OF THE MOBILE HOME PROJECT PARTICIPANTS
ON THE ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST - PRE-POST TEST

TABLE VI

	N=10 Pre		N=10 Post		
	Means	S.D.'s	Means	S.D.'s	"t"
Number Checked	111.50	40.70	110.90	30.24	.04
Defensive	18.40	7.94	18.50	5.46	-.03
Favorable Adjectives	50.20	18.94	57.30	15.34	-.14
Unfavorable Adjectives	9.60	6.34	9.80	5.87	-.07
Self-Confidence	9.10	6.90	9.10	6.54	.00
Self-Control	2.90	6.10	3.60	5.38	-.27
Lability	10.50	3.72	11.30	3.97	-.46
Personal Adjustment	10.50	4.92	10.30	6.05	.08
Achievement	12.20	6.74	11.50	5.70	.25
Dominance	11.10	7.20	12.30	6.81	-.38
Endurance	7.50	5.70	7.60	5.39	-.04
Order	7.50	5.38	6.40	5.04	.47
Intraception	13.70	4.94	14.20	5.55	-.21
Nurturance	16.00	8.83	17.80	7.88	-.48
Affiliation	22.89	8.58	23.00	7.33	-.03
Heterosexuality	9.90	4.95	10.00	4.29	-.05
Exhibition	4.50	7.86	5.60	8.47	-.30
Autonomy	5.00	4.34	5.10	4.72	-.05
Aggression	-10.00	9.02	-8.90	6.21	-.32
Change	7.70	5.48	7.40	4.72	.13
Succdrance	.30	3.83	-.40	4.95	.35
Abasement	-1.90	5.78	-3.10	5.54	.47
Deference -	.20	5.67	.70	5.21	-.21
Readiness for Counseling	-4.60	11.46	-4.40	8.93	-.04

*.05 Level of Sig.
**.01 Level of Sig.

Questionnaire for Handicapped Project Group

Did your activities of daily living change much as you moved into a Mobile Home? If so, in what way. Please describe in as much detail as possible.

Did you feel any loss of self-confidence during or shortly after your move and did your confidence increase as you found some of the problems you anticipated resolved?

Appendix B

Project Participants

St. Andrews Handicapped Students

Occupant A

Female, 22 years of age, resident of North Carolina. Disability classified as paraplegia due to birth defect. Uses wheelchair most of the time, but can use forearm crutches for short time periods.

Occupant B

Male, 21 years of age, resident of Virginia. Disability classified as paraplegia (C-7) due to poliomyelities. Restricted to wheelchair, full use of upper extremities.

Occupant C

Male, 22 years of age, resident of Georgia. Disability classified as paraplegia (C-6/7) due to poliomyelities. Restricted to wheelchair, full use of one arm, weakness in one arm.

Occupant D

Male, 25 years of age, resident of North Carolina. Disability classified as quadriplegia due to diving accident. Restricted to wheelchair, uses an electric chair exclusively, no use of lower extremities, limited use of arms and hands.

Occupant E

Female, 24 years of age, resident of North Carolina. Disability classified as quadriplegia due to poliomyelities. Restricted to wheelchair, uses electric chair exclusively, no use of lower extremities, deformed left hand and right arm.

Occupant F

Female, 22 years of age, resident of Connecticut. Disability classified as quadriplegia (C-5/6) due to diving accident.

Restricted to wheelchair, uses an electric wheelchair vast majority of the time. No use of lower extremities, limited use of arms and hands.

Occupant G

Female, 23 years of age, resident of North Carolina. Limited use of all four extremities due to birth defect. Ambulatory with the use of crutches for short periods of time, relies on manual wheelchair majority of each day.

Occupant H

Female, 21 years of age, resident of Virginia. Disability classified as quadriplegia, all extremities involved with deformed trunk. Restricted to wheelchair, uses an electric chair exclusively.

Occupant I

Male, 24 years of age, resident of Florida. Disability classified as paraplegia due to poliomyelities. Restricted to wheelchair, no use of lower extremities, muscular weakness in left shoulder.

Occupant J

Female, 23 years of age, resident of North Carolina. Disability classified as quadriplegia due to central brain damage as a result of injury in an automobile accident. Limited use of all extremities. Uses a manual wheelchair for short periods of time, relies on an electric wheelchair the vast majority of time.